

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 3-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 12-22 are amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found on pages 6-8, 10, and 13, as well as in Figures 1 and 2 of the specification as filed. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 101: Claims 13-21**

The Examiner rejects claims 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claims 13-21 have been appropriately amended, thus overcoming the Examiner's rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation: Claims 1 and 3-23**

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 3-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by *Upton, System and Method for Providing a Java Interface to an Application View Component*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0110315 A1 (June 12, 2003) (hereinafter "*Upton*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is representative of the group. Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. A method in a data processing system, for code reusability and maintainability, the method comprising:
  - providing a utility class in a server, wherein the utility class defines a utility method, the utility method being written in an object oriented programming language;
  - receiving a markup language request at the server for an entity from a client, the markup language request including a response object name;
  - responsive to receiving the markup language request at the server for the entity from the client, generating a method call for the utility method, wherein the method call identifies the entity and the response object name;
  - generating a markup language response object and assigning the response object name to the markup language response object; and
  - returning the markup language response object to the client.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In this case, each and every feature of the

presently claimed invention is not identically shown in the cited reference, arranged as they are in the claims.

*Upton* does not anticipate amended claim 1 because *Upton* does not teach each element of claim 28 as identically shown. Specifically, *Upton* does not teach “receiving a markup language request at the server for an entity from a client”, “generating a method call for the utility method,” wherein “the utility method being written in an object oriented programming language”; and then “generating a markup language response object.”

*Upton* discloses a Java-based interface that allows a Java client or application to access an application view component. An application view component can provide an interface to an application or enterprise system, using a resource adapter to expose functionality in the enterprise system. A Java-based interface for the resource adapter can allow the Java client to access the application view component. The interface can be a design-time graphical user interface, which can include a set of Java server pages and can be Web-based. The interface can allow a Java client to access the application view component in order to accomplish a task such as creating, defining, deploying, and testing the application view component. Each of these tasks can have their own page in the interface, such as a Java server page.

Conversely, the Applicant discloses a data dictionary that specifies the entities and corresponding attributes for the application program interface developers to use. The features of claim 1 call for an extensible markup language interface to be provided for customers to perform operations on the data. Application program interfaces receive extensible markup language requests and generate extensible markup language response documents that may return data from the database. A set of classes is also provided that correspond to the entities that are defined in the data dictionary. These classes define utility methods for use in retrieving data. The application program interface then appends the returned response object at the depth necessary in order to generate an extensible markup language document.

*Upton* does not teach “receiving a markup language request at the server for an entity from a client”, “generating a method call for the utility method,” wherein “the utility method being written in an object oriented programming language”; and then “generating a markup language response object” as required by amended claim 1. *Upton* therefore does not anticipate amended claim 1 because *Upton* does not teach each element of claim 28 as identically shown. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Claims 3-12 depend from claim 1. Because *Upton* fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1 as amended, *Upton* can not anticipate claims 3-12. Therefore, the rejection of claim 3-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Claims 13 and 22 have been amended to incorporate limitations similar to those added to claim 1. Therefore, the comments presented above in regards to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 13 and 22. Hence, the rejection of claims 13 and 22 under U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Claims 14-21 depend from claim 13. Because *Upton* fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 13 as amended, *Upton* can not anticipate claims 14-21. Therefore, the rejection of claim 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Claim 23 depends from claim 22. Because *Upton* fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 22 as amended, *Upton* can not anticipate claim 23. Therefore, the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

### **III. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over *Upton* and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: September 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Brandon G. Williams/  
Brandon G. Williams  
Reg. No. 48,844  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants